



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,889	07/03/2003	Harish R. Devanagondi	23019-07337	7012

  

EXAMINER
WU, JIANYE

  

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

  

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/28/2007	PAPER

7590 11/28/2007  
Gregory J Kirsch  
Needle and Rosenberg, P.C.  
999 Peachtree Street  
Suite 1000  
Atlanta, GA 30309

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/612,889

Applicant(s)

DEVANAGONDI ET AL.

Examiner

Jianye Wu

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-18,20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-18,20-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/25/03 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings Objections*

The drawings are objected to Fig. **FIG 1-4, 7-16** because of minor informalities. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Regarding **FIG 1-4, 7-16**, the lawyer's docket number should be removed from the specification, and replaced with the U.S. Serial Number.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. **Claims 1-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama et al. (US 6907001 B1, hereinafter **Nakayama**) in view of Rosen, IETF RFC 3031, "MPLS Architecture", January, 2001 (hereinafter **RFC3031**).

For **claim 1**, Nakayama discloses in a multi-slice network processor system (FIG. 1) comprising a plurality of processing slice modules, each module processing and storing a slice of packet data, a method for processing a packet in packet slices for transfer over a network interface comprising:

assigning a packet identifier (identification filed in IP packet header, line 34 of Col. 4) to the packet;

segmenting data of the packet into cells, the data including both header and body data for the packet (lines 34-35 of Col. 4);

generating cell descriptive information (82 of FIG. 14b) for each cell, the cell descriptive information including the packet identifier, and a packet position indicator indicating an order position of data of the cell with respect to the packet (82 of FIG. 14b; notice that fields in cell header can be used to store the cell descriptive information in any way needed); and

delivering one or more cells of the packet to one or more processing slice modules based upon load balancing criteria (QoS processor, line 56 of Col. 1);

storing one or more cells in a buffer in the packet slice (this is inherent from including the packet identifier to each cell: a cell must be stored in a buffer for header updating); and

generating a buffer correlation data structure correlation the buffer of the packet slice (this is inherent from including the packet identifier to each cell: cells belongs to the same packet must have the same packet identifier, which is a kind of data structure correlation).

Nakayama is **silent on** prepending a system header to the packet, the system header providing information for use by the multi-slice system;

RFC3031 teaches prepending a label to each packet (lines 1-4 of Section 3.1). The information on how the local system would process the packet is provided via the label (therefore, the label is equivalent to the system header).

Using label has many advantages, including reducing the complexity (first item of Page 4 of Nakayama) of packet processing and flexibility (second item of Page 4 of Nakayama).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use RFC3031 to modify Nakayama to to use label as the system header due to benefit of reducing the complexity of packet processing and performance enhancement.

As to **Claim 2**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 1, Nakayama further discloses wherein load balancing criteria includes that no load balancing is in effect (bypass QoS processor in line 56 of Col. 1; or configure QoS processor in a way that it does nothing to traffic).

As to **Claim 3**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 1, Nakayama further discloses wherein the packet identifier is a sequence number (identification filed in IP packet header, line 34 of Col. 4) representing an order of the packet in a communications flow and further comprising assigning a communications flow indicator to the cell descriptive information of each cell of the packet.

As to **Claim 4**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 1, Nakayama further discloses wherein the cell descriptive information further comprises a slice position indicator (identification filed in IP packet header, line 34 of Col. 4) indicating an order position of the data of the cell with respect to a slice of data of the packet.

As to **Claim 5**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 3, Nakayama further discloses the method comprising delivering body data of the packet to one or more of the processing slices ahead of the header data of the packet (out of order is implied by lines 47-48 of Col. 8).

As to **Claim 6**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 4, Nakayama further discloses the method comprising:

performing lookup functions for each slice of data (suggested by combination of 80 and 82 in FIG. 14b);

determining a size of data change in header data (suggested by combination of 80 and 82 in FIG. 14b); and

Communicating the size of data change to a queue manager via an indicator in the system header (suggested by combination of 80 and 82 in FIG. 14b).

As to **Claim 8**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 1, but **do not explicitly disclose** the method comprising generating a slice correlation data structure based on packet reference pointing to the buffer of the packet slice including the first cell of the packet.

However, in order to effectively manage the slice queue in the assembly buffers, a data structure including reference pointing to the buffer is inherently needed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a slice correlation data structure based on packet reference pointing to the buffer due to obvious industry expedient.

As to **Claim 9**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 1, Nakayama further discloses further comprising:

maintaining an independent set of upper bits of a sequence number for each communication flow (80 or 82 of FIG. 14b, where VPI or other field can be used to identify each flow); and

They **are silent on** responsive to detecting one of the processing slices delivering a sequence number that is smaller in value than an immediately preceding sequence value for the same slice, incrementing the independent set of upper bits for the respective communication flow, concatenating the set of upper bits with a set of bits of the sequence number into an index, indexing into a re-sequencing buffer space of sufficient depth to cover a slice-to-slice skew case based on the index, and resequencing the packet into its sequence order position.

However, it is obvious to one skilled in the art that sequence number be large enough to present maximum number of sequence. Furthermore, using minimum bits to present a sequence number in order to save precious space in header of the packet/cell is well known and is commonly practiced in the art to reduce overhead and to save bandwidth.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use minimum bits to present a sequence number due to benefit of reducing overhead and saving bandwidth.

As to **Claim 10**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 1, Nakayama further discloses further comprising:



generating a slice correlation data structure for the packet including a packet reference pointing to the buffer of the packet slice including the first cell of the packet, and a respective buffer indicator for the buffer in each packet slice storing the first cell in the slice for the packet (a packet is presented by a double link list data structure, which is well known in the art (Official Notice)); and

entering the slice correlation data structure as a single queue entry into a queue (each slice is a node of the double link list).

As to **Claim 11**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 1, Nakayama further discloses wherein the network interface is a switch fabric (3 of FIG. 1) and further comprising determining a destination slice across the switch fabric for each packet slice in accordance with load balancing criteria (QoS processor, line 56 of Col. 1).

As to **Claim 12**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 11, Nakayama further discloses further comprising:

for a received packet from the switch fabric, storing each cell of each packet slice of the received packet, each cell including descriptive information, in the processing slice identified in a destination slice indicator of the descriptive information (82 of FIG. 14b).

As to **Claim 13**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 12, Nakayama further discloses further comprising sending an enqueue message for each packet slice identifying a storage location of the first cell of the slice (22 of FIG. 6).

As to **Claim 14**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 13 further comprising:

generating a slice correlation data structure for the packet based upon the storage location, of the first cell of each slice of the packet, and the packet identifier in each cell's descriptive information;

responsive to the size of data having been changed as indicated in the indicator in the system header, determining packet size adjustment; and

entering the slice correlation data structure as a single queue entry into a queue (22 of FIG. 6, reconstruction of a slice).

As to **Claim 15**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the method of claim 13, Nakayama further discloses further comprising:

upon initiation of retrieval of the packet, generating a new packet identifier for the packet;

sending a dequeue message for each slice of the packet;

correlating each cell of the packet into packet form based on cell descriptive information including the packet position indicator and the slice position indicator; and

ordering the packet for transmission to an attached network based on the new packet identifier (OUT-1, FIG. 16, reconstruction of a packet).

For **Claim 16**, it is the corresponding system claim of claim 1, therefore, is rejected for the same reason as explained in claim 1 above.

As to **Claim 17**, it is the corresponding system claim of claim 2, therefore, is rejected for the same reason as explained in claim 2 above.

As to **Claim 18**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the system of claim 16, Nakayama further discloses wherein the network interface is a switch fabric (3 of FIG. 1), and wherein each channel communication interface comprises a port connection with the switch fabric (LI-1 to LI-n of FIG. 1).

As to **Claim 20**, it is the corresponding system claim of claim 15, therefore, is rejected for the same reason as explained in claim 15 above.

As to **Claim 21**, Nakayama and RFC3031 in combination disclose the system of claim 16, Nakayama further discloses wherein the buffer manager comprises an ingress buffer manager (16 of FIG. 2) including an ingress buffer memory space for each processing slice, the ingress buffer memory space for storing cells received from the respective processing slice, and an egress buffer memory space (22 of FIG. 6) for each processing slice, the egress buffer memory space for storing cells received from the switch fabric for each respective processing slice.

### ***Response to Amendments/Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/02/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. For Applicant's remark on drawing objections, **FIG 1-4, 7-16** still has the lawyer's docket number, which should be removed and replaced with the U.S. Serial Number.
5. For Applicant's remark on 103 rejections, Applicant amends independent claims 1 (and similarly 16) by adding the following limitations:

"storing one or more cells in a buffer in the packet slice; and

generating a buffer correlation data structure correlation the buffer of the packet slice."

Applicant argues that the prior art cited by Examiner does not disclose these limitations.

6. In response, the newly added limitations are implicitly taught by the cited prior art already: in order to put the packet identifier to each cell as taught by the prior art, a cell must be stored in a buffer for header updating; and the cells belongs to the same packet must have the same packet identifier, which is a kind of data structure correlation.

Please see the rejection section above for more details.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number:  
10/612,889  
Art Unit: 2616

Page 12

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jianye Wu whose telephone number is (571)270-1665. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday, 8am to 7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571)272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jianye Wu

11/21/07



*Seema S. Rao*  
SEEMA S. RAO 11/26/07  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600